

<b>Application No.</b> 10/637,223	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LIU, ZICHENG	
<b>Examiner</b> Sheela C. Chawan	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

**Status of Application:**

(3) Mrs. Katrina A. Lyon (Reg # 42,821).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Ok to  
enter  
see  
3/2/07

PATENT APPLICATION  
MS No. 303631.01  
Attorney Docket No. MCS-036-03

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of Liu	:	Group Art Unit: 2624
	:	
Entitled: A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR MODELING THREE DIMENSIONAL OBJECTS FROM A SINGLE IMAGE	:	Examiner: Chawan, Sheela C.
	:	
Serial No.: 10/637,223	:	
	:	
Filing Date: August 8, 2003	:	

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY/PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

Hon. Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the telephonic interview between Examiner Chawan and Katrina Lyon of February 27, 2007 the applicants provide this proposed amendment to the specification to place the above-identified application in condition for allowance.

### IN THE SPECIFICATION

Please amend the specification, on page 12, starting at line 13, as follows:

"In the most general sense, a single image of an object is input into the system and method according to the invention and a three-dimensional (3D) mesh with the texture of the original image is output. An overall flow diagram of the 3D modeling system and method is shown in FIG. 2. As shown in FIG. 2, process action 202, an image of an object is input into the system and method according to the invention. An object detector is used to find the object to be modeled in the image, as shown in process action 204. Then the features of the object are determined (process action 206). If the feature determination process action shows that the object is rotated out of the plane of the image, the amount of rotation is determined (process action 208), and this information is used to rotate the model to match the input image. The features of the object to be modeled are then used to align the feature points of the object in the image to a generic model of the object (process action 210). Once the generic model is so tailored to match the object in the image, the texture of the original image is applied (process action 212). The tailored model can be used for various applications. For example, in one embodiment the object to be modeled in an animal. "

### REMARKS

The application has been amended to put it in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action of November 1, 2006, Claims 10, 16, 20 and 21 were held to be allowable if amended to include the limitations of the claims from which it depends. In the Amendment of January 30, 2007, the allowable subject matter of Claim 10 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 1.

In a telephonic interview between Examiner Chawan and Katrina Lyon on February 27, 2007, the Examiner stated that the subject matter for Claim 10 did not appear to be supported in the specification. The applicants believe that Claim 10 is supported by FIG. 2 and the associated text describing it. However, since Claim 10 is an original claim, and the object being modeled being an animal is not specifically called out in the specification, the applicants are proposing amending the specification in order to specifically call out this subject matter in the specification.

This amendment is not new matter. Per the MPEP, Section 608.01,


"In establishing a disclosure, applicant may rely not only on the description and drawing as filed but also on the original claims if their content justifies it.

Where subject matter not shown in the drawing or described in the description is claimed in the application as filed, and such original claim itself constitutes a clear disclosure of this subject matter, then the claim should be treated on its merits, and requirement made to amend the drawing and description to show this subject matter. The claim should not be attacked either by objection or rejection because this subject matter is lacking in the drawing and description. It is the drawing and description that are defective, not the claim."

It is believed that specification, as well as Claims 2-7, 10, 11, 13, 16-18 and 21 and 22 are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is

respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (805) 278-8855 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Katrina A. Lyon", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Katrina A. Lyon

Registration No. 42,821

Attorney for Applicants

LYON & HARR, LLP  
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800  
Oxnard, CA 93036  
(805) 278-8855